

REMARKS

An advisory action dated October 14, 2008 has been received and reviewed by the Applicants. No claims have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-15 are in the application. Claims 7-10 and 12 are withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims as currently presented is requested for the following reasons.

In the advisory action, the Examiner states that the suggestion of Liao would have made it obvious to have placed the evaporation materials of Hosokawa into a single source.

Paragraph [0004] of Liao concerns the manufacture of cathodes using two evaporation sources, but acknowledges that that a dual source evaporation source is more complicated than a single source. Liao does not teach or suggest how to make alloy cathodes using a single source. The Applicants have argued that the Mg/Ag or Mg/Al alloys described in Liao cannot be effectively used in a single evaporation source or boat because of the large difference in vapor pressure.

The Examiner states that although the placement of these materials in a single evaporation source would have not been effective, there is no suggestion that it would have been inoperable.

The Applicants believe that one with ordinary skill in the art would have known that the co-evaporation of these materials from a single source would fail to produce working devices. The limitations of thermal vapor deposition are well understood by those skilled in the art and it would have been appreciated that heating a metal containing evaporation source well above the sublimation temperature will lead to indiscriminate deposition of the metal.

The accompanying 1.132 declaration of Dr. L-S Liao, the inventor of the Liao reference as well as a co-inventor of this application, makes it clear that using a single evaporation source for combinations of Mg/Ag or Mg/Al alloy would be inoperative. It would not produce usable devices and is damaging to the evaporation chamber. These observations are confirmed in a second 1.132 declaration by Mr. S. Van Slyke, an expert in OLED manufacture.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested. If the Examiner sees any problems with the above, Applicant's attorney would appreciate the courtesy of a telephone call.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/das
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.